

Bundy's Departure By Chalmers M. Roberts

State Department Relationship

IN A CURIOUSLY typical Washington way the departure of McGeorge Bundy could lead sooner than later to the arrival of a new Secretary of State.

It has nothing to do with any current presidential dissatisfaction with Dean Rusk. It does have to do with the changing relationship between Mr. Johnson and the State Department, especially with the Secretary.

Dean Rusk has recently taken with quiet dignity some rough lumps from the Kennedy Administration biographers. These attacks, as could have been anticipated, had the countereffect of producing strong public endorsements from President Johnson. Quite probably Rusk could stay on for the rest of the Johnson term, or terms, if he desires.

But on occasion the Secretary, though only 56, has indicated he is unlikely to stay all that long. The job, indeed, is physically exhausting. But most important of all is the matter of the concept of the Secretary's job.

ACCORDING, without predicting a Rusk departure it is possible to talk about potential Rusk successors. There have been times, too when the President has pondered that potential problem with closemouthed visitors.

As the war in Vietnam grew, the President talked of Rusk as his man for making peace and of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara as his man for making war, if there is no peace. Unhappily, negotiations are nowhere in sight. Though Rusk continues to search for any possible route to the conference table, it is McNamara who is more and more the key adviser to the President on Vietnam.

There was a time when Mr. Johnson's enthusiasm for McNamara was so great he considered making him a



Roberts

sort of super-Cabinet chief. There has been talk, too, of moving him over to State. McNamara, however, has shown no flair for diplomacy even remotely comparable to his brilliant management of the Pentagon. Furthermore, his Congressional relations have begun to deteriorate.

At any rate, moving McNamara to State is hardly logical now for another reason. The United States needs a Secretary of State with a strong peace image at any time and above all in the midst of an escalating war. McNamara's appointment probably would convince much of the world, however unfairly, that the Russians are right in charging the Administration with "whipping up (a) military psychosis" and trying "to create an atmosphere conducive to war."

MAYBE the ideal man, from this standpoint, would be Hubert H. Humphrey, now that Adlai Stevenson is dead. But Humphrey is Vice President and the constitutional wrench would be considerable even though there is no law saying he could not also be Secretary of State.

From another standpoint, Mr. Johnson needs a Secretary who is known for his clear realization of the basically unbridgeable gulf between communism and democracy but who at the same time is determined to do everything possible to prevent the mutual antagonism from leading to war.

Here a number of names come to mind. W. Averell Harriman certainly fits the description and besides he has had immense diplomatic experience. But he is 74. David K. E. Bruce, now Ambassador in London, also fits but he is 67.

Or there is Arthur J. Goldberg, a mere 57, who many felt was picked for the United Nations job with the possibility clearly in the presidential mind that he might some day wind up at State. But he has been at the United Nations less than

five months and he had no prior diplomatic experience.

Some believe the President, who likes surprises, might reach out for an old friend, perhaps James E. Webb, 59, now head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Webb was Under Secretary of State in the final years of the Truman Administration after serving as budget director. Or perhaps George C. McGhee, 53, now Ambassador in Bonn, who has held several important posts at State, might be chosen.

OR IT COULD simply be a matter of upping the current number two man. George W. Ball, about to turn 56, who has worn well with the President as Under Secretary.

There is another possibility, too. He is Clark M. Clifford, the Washington lawyer, who will be 59 on Christmas day. He was special counsel to President Truman for four years and he has had many quiet but important roles in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. Only a few weeks ago Clifford visited Southeast Asia on a confidential mission for the President.

Despite his obvious preference for a lucrative law practice plus the presidential adviser role, it is hardly conceivable that he would decline the top-ranking Cabinet post. Indeed he has been spending a good deal more time on chores for Mr. Johnson than he did for Mr. Kennedy.

If and when the President and Rusk mutually agree on a parting, the critical factor is likely to be how they have come to vie with the office of Secretary. Bundy's departure is likely to force a clarification of views because of the "increasing contacts" between Mr. Johnson and Rusk which the White House now says will be the result.

RUSK has always had as his hero Gen. George C. Marshall, the perfect chief of staff in both the Pentagon and State Department. Loyalty to the President and

a view that the Chief Executive has the primary responsibility for origination and formulation of policy, plus a loose control over the department, are Rusk characteristics.

Now with foreign affairs devouring more and more of Mr. Johnson's time, with Bundy's brilliant assistance gone, with more war than peace in the world, the President will be more than ever face to face with his Secretary of State.

The question, then, is how much and how soon will Mr. Johnson want a man who will produce a brilliant flow of policy proposals, and a man able to inspire and galvanize the State Department.